SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

On the Economic slowdown, fall in GDP Rate and Deteriorating Financial condition of the country in the context of mid-term appraisal of the Ninth Five Year Plan - *Contd.*

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, a number of speakers have spoken on the subject, giving data and figures. I would not like to repeat all that. I would like to quote from an article in the Organiser of July, 2000. I don't want to score any political point on that. I am quoting from the Organiser. I thought of quoting it because it was in July, 2000, a year ago; and the issue raised then is still very much relevant when we talk about economic slowdown. We don't think that it is a question of only two or three months. This is an article by Mr. D. D. Thengde in the Organiser of July, 2000, in which it has been stated, "Economic reform, initiated in 1991 by the Narasimha Rao Government, is believed to have entered an irreversible phase. With successive Governments pursuing the reforms more zealously than ever, the Indian economy has changed its course for better than worse. Tall promises were made at the beginning of the process and, after almost a decade, it seems we have not quite fulfilled them. Instead, the economy has become only vulnerable than ever. Here are a few facts and figures...", that have been quoted in the article. I think the parameters that were chosen in this particular article should attract the attention of the whole House. What was expected of these reforms at the time of the introduction of these reforms? It says, "Increased share in world trade, productivity of domestic industry, creation of new assets and establishment of new industries, poverty eradication, employment generation, technology transfer, capital inflow in the form of investment". These are the specific parameters for the success of the reforms. So, when we are discussing this subject, one part to look at is the economic management. This side knows it because it has ruled the country for forty years. The other side is having an experience of it. But what was not attempted, except by Mr. Chitharanjan, was, whether it was in the interest of the nation that there should be a review of these policies. And this policy is not generalised -- that I am against this reform or he is for the reforms or he is thinking in a balanced way -- but it is sector-wise and on facts, not on theories. He has given these parameters. He is speaking from one spectrum of politics. We belong to a different spectrum. But here on these common issues, there should be a factual analysis as to where we stand

after a decade. I am not restricting it to periods as Mr. Pranab Mukherjee was trying to while saying 'within three years', 'within this one year' and so on. I am not, because the figures that I am going to quote here, do not indicate that, irrespective of whatever regimes there might have been, what we have actually gained. What is really the most alarming, apart from all this data, is the issue of demand. You have that report of the Planning Commission; you have the Mid-Term Review; and the Annual Plan of 2000-01 which is also quite revealing. But apart from this year, what has been the pattern of demand in the last two-three years? The economy has slowed down. All of them agree that there has been economic slowdown. The demand is decreasing. The demand is continuously shrinking. This is a major issue which we must attack. Why is the demand shrinking? Is it only a three-month phenomenon? Is it a transient phenomenon? What did it say, Sir? I will talk about steel. Why do I talk about steel? I talk about steel because four blast furnaces are under shut down right now because demand of steel isn't there. Against a consumption target of 38MT in the terminal year of 2001-02, this year, 2000-01, it was hardly 26MT. About a hundred mini-steel plants have been closed down. This is in spite of the fact that bail-out packages were given in 1999. The bail-out packages were given for certain private steel plants. Rs.5,420 crores were invested in these private steel plants; some of these plants were not in a position of being completed and they wanted some money as a bail-out package -- that famous Guruswamy thing; I am not going into that part of it. When the bail-out packages were given, a working group on steel sector was made under the chairmanship of Special Secretary (Banking Division) to consider this 'last mile projects, as Mr. Chidambaram called it; and this Government called it 'bail-out package'.

And there it was told, "the Government is taking various steps to give impetus to infrastructure sector, which, in turn, would boost the demand for steel, particularly long products." It was explained like this. I am quoting from the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee of IDBI before giving the bailout package where they referred to this Special Working Group Report, "though presently the steel industry was passing through a difficult phase, the long term prospects of the steel industry appear to be reasonably good." Sir, this was the position on 26th November, 1998. When the bailout package was sanctioned, at that time, in its terms of sanction, the Finance Bill 1999-2000 was discussed, and it was envisaged, and I quote, "the growth in investment in infrastructure, housing

and industrial sector is likely to boost the demand for steel products and improve prospects for the industry". Sir, since then, hardly two years have passed. This is the long term or short term perspective planning for developing the steel industry because you are going to create infrastructure there. To that extent, capital was infused in the steel industry. Today, after two years, we don't find it. Tomorrow, someone can question, and I don't know what will be the answer. Is planning becoming irrelevant? In the 9th Plan, the power consumption -- I am not talking about power generation -- was envisaged at a 9 per cent growth. I would like to bring it to the notice of the Minister that in this whole period of five years, in the case of power consumption, demand and power requirement -- I have seen it from the Annual Report -- the growth is hardly five per cent. What does it indicate? Can tomorrow someone say that planning has beeome irrelevant in this country? You are talking about market as a *mantra;* you are shifting from the planned economy to the market economy. Tomorrow, someone can say that the Minister of Planning is not necessary because this is what we planned two years back -- it is not a five year plan for steel -- today, we find that the demand is not there. We are planning for power consumption at nine per cent. But, we don't see it. Sir, Coal production in 1993 was 297 million tonnes. I can quote these figures. The terminal year of the Ninth Plan is 2001-2002, the coal production envisaged to be is 308 million tonnes. Ten million tonnes in the span of eight years. Coal is one of the major feedstocks. Is it planning? Is this planning becoming irrelevant? The most alarming fact which you will find is about the figure of diesel consumption. For the first time, I have found, if I am wrong, you can correct me -- this is the Annual Report of 2000-2001 of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas -- the diesel consumption, as per the present trends, this year, *i.e.* in the year 2000-2001, is 38 million tonnes. Last year, it was 39 million tonnes. For the first time, diesel consumption is coming down. What does it indicate?

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal) : They use water for generating power.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: We are not going into that. This specifically shows that diesel consumption in agriculture, industry and transport sectors is going down.

The other day, the Railway Minister was telling that the target of wagons for the Ninth Plan was 1,36,000 four-wheeler units. They procured 85,000 to 86,000 four-wheeler units. Now, his traffic managers are telling him that, at present, they don't require wagons because for the Ninth Plan, against their targeted freight of 525 million tonnes, the traffic is hardly going to be 490 million tonnes. I had heard the same thing when Shri Jaffer Sharief was the Railway Minister in 1994-95. He said that they didn't require wagons because the present fleet of wagons was enough for managing the freight. After two years, we find something different. This repetition of whatever happening is clearly showing that the economic slowdown is there. Now, I think, no one would admit it. Instead, what Pranab Mukherjee was trying to tell that this economic slowdown was a product of after-Congress or pre-Congress -- I am not going into that -- the problem is, the demand is not increasing; the demand is diminishing; the market is diminishing. When you are talking about market, which market are you depending upon? When Mr. Thengadi says -- I am again telling you, Mr. Shourie, please don't quote from Marx to counter that -- what I say is -- it is so puzzling -- what he is saying is absolutely correct. When we are talking about the share in the world trade within 10 years, is it not a big period? Okay, this is what we did. We gave you 10 years. In these ten years, how much has our share increased in the world trade?

If this increase is not substantial, बहुत छोटा-सा अगर growth है, then you will have to depend on the internal market. If you have to depend on the internal market, how are you developing it? Where is the internal market? Who is going to develop it? Who is going to develop the infrastructure? Who is going to develop the demand? The basic question that arises is, as Mr. Ramachandraiah had raised, about the agricultural reforms. This should be our priority before we talk of world trade or world market. It did not find the priority. We have been saying right from the beginning that the agricultural reforms don't only mean investment, it also means land reforms. But it is normally avoided in the House for some reasons. If that is the case, hasn't the time come for a review? I am not saying you go back totally. Why has the market gone down? Why has the agricultural production gone down?

I can tell you wherefrom the projects can come. In 1999, this Government had approved a project at Hazira, the Kribhco Urea Plant. About that project, today, after two years, we have been told that it is not

necessary. Hazira, Thal, Gorakhpur and Nellore were the four projects sanctioned, in principle, by the Cabinet in 1999. Today, I hear that it is being reviewed: "No, our consumption-production is such that it is not necessary." If the demand were not there, wherefrom the projects would come then? Wherefrom the infrastructure would come up?

I would like to know whether the Government feels for a review of reforms before you talk about consensus. Let us not delude ourselves. In every place, in every group, whosoever is sitting here,--whether it is the BJP or the Congress--there have never been a consensus on the reforms. The debate has been going on. When I am talking about this, this debate is going on. The debate may be in different parts, different spheres or from different premises. But to say that there has been a consensus, I think, you are deluding yourself. Even in the Congress itself, they had a Group who had discussed the present form of the economic policies, to find whether a review of the reforms was necessary. Even in the Treasury Benches, who have been presenting the case on economy and Budget, the debate is on. Maheshji is not here, he used to speak. I don't know why he is not speaking nowadays.

What I am saying is, the debate is going on. Then, why are you deluding yourself to say that "there is a consensus and let us talk about only the macro management, on tax, on GDP, etc." There have been differences still persisting within all the political parties, of all hues and colours, a consensus has not come. Today's results of economic reforms, after ten years, have made everyone to rethink. I am saying, let it be sector-wise. Agriculture, yes; industry, yes. What is the position on the industry? I am not going into the public sector or the private sector.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up; please wind up. Now it is going to be one o'clock. I want to have the sense of the House. Do you want to continue till 1.30 p.m.?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal) : Sir, it is for your consideration. In the afternoon, at 2.30, we have the Private Members Business. I think, we can go up to 1.30 p.m. and then adjourn for lunch.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, on disinvestment, more or less, whenever I raise the issue, Mr. Shourie's eyes roam around to see where the conspirator against disinvestment is. Today, it is not a conspirator. Someone is trying to motivate. It is not a question of the public sector or the private sector. Look at the figures. The industrial sickness, in 1997, the number of non-SSI sick units was 2,368. I am not spilling this range. I can go to that of 1991. In 1991, this number was 1461. In 1999, it is 2792. This is the number of sick non-SSI units. It has doubled in ten years and from 1997 onwards, 28 per cent increase is there. In 1991, the number of sick small scale units was 2,21,472. Today it is 3,06,221. Now, I come to the money blocked. Mr. Prasad is not here. He as was asking about the money which is going to the public sector - whether it is private sector or public sector, do not mind, but mostly it is in the private sector. What is the amount of money blocked? The amount is Rs.15,150 crores. There is a misconception in this country that it is public money which is in the public sector and it is the private money which is in the private sector. This is banks' money. The outstanding bank credit is Rs.15,150 crores. Whose money is it? It is also public money. What is the amount outstanding bank credit even against the SSI units? It is Rs.4313 crores. What is the level of sickness of those units which have been referred to the BIFR? Sir, in 1997, it was 2084 and within three years the number of sick units referred to the BIFR is 3296. Out of these 3296 units referred to the BIFR, how many are public sector units? This number is only 75. Rest are what? How does it matter? There are two types of companies. In private sector there are well-managed, professionally-managed units. There are badly managed private companies which divert the money and run into losses. They are not competitive. In the public sector, there are well-managed units and there are badly managed units. Industry as a whole is facing this recession not only today. But today this recession is more. This has been the strain all through after we have gone through the reforms. What have we actually got out of it? With regard to employment, these are Mr. D.B. Thengadi's figures. All these are the given facts. It was 3,65,00,000 in 1991 and 4,11,00,000 in 1999. These are all registered. I am not going into the non-registered. The common man does not ask these figures. He is not bothered about the GDP figures or other figures. He wants the facts. When you are talking about market economy, you have to see the financial results and whether they are viable. I am asking about your scheme, ten years' scheme, reforms scheme, whether this has been found viable on this

parameter. If it has been found viable, give us the facts and figures. If this is connected with the world recession that is going on and the global recession and that is why our impact is so bad, then is it not necessary at certain stage that we must have a rethinking on certain sectors. ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, I would like to ask the Government here frankly whether these reforms have been under compulsion. That has been the complaint with this side also. These reforms, this competitiveness, globalisation is of our own volition, we want to know. If it is under compulsion, then we should tell the people to prepare themselves for a policy change which suits the people. There is no idea of chanting *mantras* like reforms, reforms and market without giving any results to the people. What are the alternatives? How can you have the reforms? How can you have any financial investment, capital formation when saving is not there? By reducing the interest rate for the common man on his savings in the post-offices, in the banks, in the UTI and everywhere, you want to have savings. Wherefrom do the savings come? Everybody has touched this issue already. What type of investments have you got? You have not got the foreign direct investment. You know it. So, internal investments have to come. Wherefrom do these investments come? It may be public investment or private investment. If the dichotomy is between public and private, public investment has to grow. Then are we not having the Minister of Planning? We are having a part of the planned economy and planned investment. Then you are talking about market and that you leave it to the market. The market does not require a planning commission, as someone says. Which aspects of market are you telling? Sir, the alternatives are there. There are certain sources. Sir, we are talking about it that the major source of our expenditure is the petroleum products. The consensus is only on a question of how disinvestment has to be done and how the reforms *mantras* are to be chanted. The consensus is there in the Standing Committee Report. The main point where we are having this foreign exchange drained is on the petroleum products.

1.00 P.M.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI) in the Chair]

What was the consensus that arrived at in the Standing Committee five years ago headed by Mr. Jaswant Singh? The Committee said that the first and the foremost thing we want is an integrated fuel policy. We do not have that. Could you do it in ten years? Could you do it in three years? We are talking about the CNG. Sir, 70 per cent of our fuel consumption, our petroleum products and crude oil is being imported. And, Mr. Ram Naik is saying with pride, 'I have 103 per cent capacity for refining.' How does it matter? Sir, 70 per cent of our crude is being imported. What has happened? What is the result? The result is: No public investment. We went in for a new exploration policy. It was initiated in 1997. Four years have already passed but nothing has been done on this. How many tonnes of crude oil been added to the stock of this country? We are for reforms. What is our point of reform? I am citing one example. Our reform is, 'Yes. We are for reforms.' If we want to use coal as the only major alternative fuel for this country, we have to get the technology from somewhere for getting fluidised boiler for using poor quality of coal, rather than getting coal from Australia because it is a better coal. I would like to have a reform where you will get coal gasification process. I think there is no Member here from the Telugu Desam Party. Instead of keeping alive the coal based fertilizer plants at Ramagundam and Talcheru, they are going in for more Oil/Gas based power plants and Oil/Gas based fertilizer plants. The hon. Prime Minister had set up a group in 1999 on coal gasification. Nothing has happened on that. That is not in our priority. Our priority is, disinvestment. What disinvestment? Disinvestment for whom? If it is for Budgetary deficit, okay, you can come and tell us. But, why are you disinvesting the IBP? It is generating employment ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, just two minutes. What my reforms will say? I would like to have someone else to come here and have those retail outlets. The IBP has got about 1,000 to 1,500 outlets. If you want to create assets, you can do so. But, by just acquisition of the IBP, are you creating any asset? If someone wants to sell his oil, let him come, have his own marketing set up, have his outlets -- 1,000 or 1,500 or whatever it is. What are you gaining from this? What capital assets are you going to create through this acquisition or giving public sector or private sector in someone's hands? If you want to have sick public sector undertakings being taken over by certain people, I can understand. But,

how are you going to create any new assets through sale of profit making undertakings, which are creating assets?

Sir, the last point which I want to touch upon is: Our apprehension is that our institutions are being destroyed. Whatever has happened, has happened. You cannot build a BHEL overnight. It takes time. You can destroy the BHEL at one go. This Government is destroying the system and the institutions developed for national savings and for capital mobilisation. This is the major charge. Because, tomorrow, if someone wants to change this reform policy, in the interest of the people, he cannot do so since the institutions are already being destroyed. Take the case of the UTI. Take the case of the CBDT. The way you are choosing your people, the way you are dismantling these institutions, through which we can even revive our country and the economy, is very bad. The revival of the economy has slowed down. The economy is going backtrack and you are destroying the institutions that are required to push the economy forward. This is our major charge against this Government. Some former Cabinet Minister is going outside and saying how a chief executive is being appointed. Well, this is how the things are going on. There are also charges on the IDBI. It has been headless for six months. It has been a headless organisation for six months! And, someone is being pushed without any clearance from the Central Vigilance Commission. And, Sir, after six months, you will find that that fellow will be in the CBI net and that fellow will be responsible. Why? IDBI's money of so many thousands of crores would have gone astray or to some non-existing firms. Sir, my charge against this Government is that they are finishing all institutions. There is a whopping Rs. 45,000 crores of tax default in customs, excise and income tax.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Please, conclude now.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Within three years, the amount of tax evasion has gone up to Rs. 62,000 crores. Where is the money? Sir, NPAs stand at Rs. 50,000 crores! I am not talking about the NPAs. These are the people who are trying to advise you as to how economic consensus has been arrived at in this country. Sir, Gandhiji also had businessmen; he was seeking their assistance, but only to suit his policy for national independence. It is not the other way. It is not that the corporates will

dictate as to how the political parties have to come to a consensus on economic issues without politicians. They have to follow the policy which we frame here and should mend themselves to our needs rather than the corporates demanding us how to make an economic policy on consensus.I feel this is an insult to Parliament. I know through this debate we cannot find a solution. But, if, at least, through this debate a view emerges that sector-wise review -- from agriculture to industry -- is necessary, not just tinkering here and there with cosmetic changes, as Mr. Mukherjee was asking for, it would be a meaningful debate. On the basis of your analysis, you can inform the people where reforms were under compulsion, and where they were on their own volition. That should be made clear to the people. Thank you very much.

श्री सी.एम.इब्राहीम (कर्णाटक) : शुक्रिया उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, सारा देश बड़ी आशा के साथ देख रहा था क्योंकि स्वदेशी के नाम पर इस देश की सत्ता में आए। लेकिन यह देश का दुर्भाग्य है कि पिछले तीन सालों में रिफार्म्स के नाम पर देश का जो दिवाला निकला है यदि उससे ये सत्ता में बैठे लोग आंख नहीं खोलेंगे - कारगिल ने देश को काफी नुकसान पहुंचाया और जो आर्थिक कारगिल इस देश में भैरव तांडव का नृत्य कर रहा है, पांच साल तक यदि देश की आर्थिक स्थिति यही रही तो मैं समझता हूं कि इस देश को बर्बाद होने में काफी समय नहीं लगेगा। अभी-अभी हमारे साथी ने इंडस्ट्रीज के बारे में कहा कि पहले सत्ता वालों को समझना चाहिए कि भारत देश क्या है। भारत शहरों का देश है या गांवों का देश है? आज देश की अस्सी फीसदी आबादी कृषि पर निर्भर है। अगर आज आप गांव की हालत देखें, कृषि को देखें तो देखेंगे कि किसान अनाज पैदा कर रहा है लेकिन जो मूल्य किसान को तीन साल पहले मिलता था क्या आज भी वही मूल्य मिल रहा है? नारियल पांच हजार रुपये था आज दो हजार रुपये है। काफी, आर्कनेड, पैडी, गन्ना, रागी, ज्वार, फल आदि में क्या इस रिफार्म से देश के किसान को कुछ फायदा हुआ है? आपको यह सोचना चाहिए कि यह एक पार्टी का मामला नहीं है। हमने फाइनेंस कन्सलटेटिव कमेटी में कहा है कि आप इसे एक पार्टी का मामला समझकर मत सोचिएगा, यह देश का मामला है। जिस तरह अभी-अभी हमारे साथी ने कहा कि यह देश की सौ करोड़ जनता का मामला है इसलिए कांग्रेस, बी.जे.पी., जनता दल, मार्क्सिस्ट आदि को बैठकर इस पर सोचना चाहिए कि किस तरह से इसे रिवर्स कर सकते हैं। बेशक कांग्रेस ने इसे रिफार्म्स के नाम पर शुरू किया है लेकिन रिफार्म्स के मायने क्या दिवाला है? रिफार्म्स के मायने क्या बेचना है? आठ सौ साल विदेशियों की हुकूमत हम सह चुके हैं। एक बार अगर आर्थिक आजादी खत्म हो गई तो बोलने की आजादी मिलेगी ही नहीं। आर्थिक आजादी सबसे बड़ी है। अंग्रेज इस मुल्क में सिर्फ शासन करने नहीं आए थे, व्यापार करने के लिए आए थे लेकिन आज दोबारा से वे ही मल्टी नेशनल - वे पानी के जहाज से आए थे, ये हवाई जहाज से आ रहे हैं, आज फर्क सिर्फ इतना है कि अगर एक बार हमारी आर्थिक आजादी खत्म हो गई तो चाहे आप पार्लियामेंट में बोलें, चिल्लाएं, पैसा उनके हाथ में है, सत्ता उनके हाथ में है। जहां तक एग्रीकल्चर की बात है तो जितना थाइलैण्ड का चावल है, आस्ट्रेलिया का ऐपल है। जितना डम्प हो रहा है इस देश में, किसी ने देखा है कि इस चीज की

जरूरत थी या नहीं? मुझे आज इंदिरा जी की याद आती है। 1980 से पहले कोई भी चीज आयात करने के लिए बीसों चीजों की परमीशन की जरूरत पड़ती थी। आज जितना सारा माल, जहाजों के जरिए, रास्तों के जरिए इस देश के अंदर आ रहा है उसका क्या कोई हिसाब है कि कितना माल आ रहा है? जो चीज हमारी जरूरत की है, जब वे चीजें यहां पर उपलब्ध हैं तो मैं पूछता हूं कि उनको विदेशों से लाने की जरूरत क्या है? डब्लूटीओ के रिफार्म अगर इस देश के हित के लिए नहीं है तो किस चीज का कंपलशन हमारे ऊपर है? हो सकता है कि गलती हुई हो। लेकिन गलती सुधारने का काम, गलती पर पश्चाताप जो करता है उसका व्यक्तित्व सबसे ऊंचा हो जाता है। हमें उम्मीद थी कि इस देश के प्रधानमंत्री इस रिफार्म्स को रिवर्स करेंगे और कहेंगे कि देश हित के लिए यह ठीक नहीं है, इसलिए हम डब्लूटीओ से वापस आने के बारे में इस पर पूरी तरह विचार करें। एक नहीं बल्कि पूरे मामलों को लेकर आप इसको कर सकते हैं। यूएफ सरकार जब थी तो उस समय इस पर चर्चा शुरू हुई थी। लेकिन बदकिस्मती से यह नहीं हुआ। अगर एक-दो साल वह सरकार कन्टिन्यू करती तो हो सकता था कि कोई निर्णय उस वक्त हो जाता। लेकिन हमने अपने जमाने में कभी सेल नहीं किया। प्राइवेट पार्टिसिपेशन 49 परसेंट था। लेकिन आप 51 परसेंट पर दे रहे हैं। बचे 49 परसेंट, इसका मतलब क्या है? सर उनके हाथ में, हृदय उनके हाथ में और आपके हाथ में पांव रहेगा। अब बाल्को को 51 परसेंट में दिया और आपके हाथ में हैं 49 परसेंट। इससे अच्छा था कि पूरा का पूरा ही दे देते। इसकी कोई जरूरत नहीं रह गई थी। मैनेजमेंट उनके हाथ में है और सरकार जो है वह उनके ऐशोआराम के लिए 49 परसेंट लगाकर कह रही है कि हमने पूरा नहीं बेचा है, आधा बेचा है। जब फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर की राधा ही गई तो यह आधा लेकर आप क्या करेंगे?

जहां तक सोशल स्टेटस का सवाल है क्या प्राइवेट सेक्टर में आपने देखा है कि क्या कहीं किसी बैकवर्ड क्लास को, किसी दलित को रखा जा रहा है। इस देश में पिछड़ों और दलितों को खत्म करने की यह सबसे बड़ी साजिश है। सरकारी उद्योग होते तो 18 परसेंट, 23 परसेंट रिजर्वेशन होता। मल्टीनेशनल्स में बैकवर्ड क्लासेज कितने हैं, शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट के कितने हैं? मल्टीनेशनल्स के कम्प्यूटर्स में यह वर्ड ही नहीं है। वह कंप्यूटर से पूछेगा कि क्या कोई बैकवर्ड क्लास या शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट है तो वह कहेगा कि बैकवर्ड भी नहीं है और शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट भी नहीं है क्योंकि उनके कंप्यूटर में यह वर्ड है ही नहीं। आज देश में सिर्फ आर्थिक ही नहीं बल्कि समाज की सामाजिक व्यवस्था जो है, उसको हजारों साल पहले की तरफ दुबारा पीछे ले जाने की कोशिश इस रिफार्म के जरिए हो रही है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या इस पर आपने सोचा है? आज देश में, अभी बता रहे थे कि चार करोड़ से ज्यादा अनइम्पलाइड हैं कंप्यूटर, कंप्यूटर, कंप्यूटर की इस देश को जरूरत नहीं है। हमारी मांग क्या है, इस देश में क्या नहीं है, बताइए? क्या चाय नहीं है, काफी नहीं है, चावल नहीं हैं, गेहूं नहीं हैं, सोना नहीं है, लोहा नहीं है, चांदी नहीं है? सब कुछ इस देश में है। लेकिन अगर नीयत की मैनेजमेंट हो तो भारत को किसी पर निर्भर करने की जरूरत नहीं है। भारत अपने पैरों पर खड़ा हो सकता है। **..(समय की घंटी)..** मैंने तो अभी शुरू ही किया है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : 9 मिनट तय किए गए हैं।

श्री सी.एम. इब्राहीम : हम चाहते हैं कि आप इस बात को छोड़िये कि भाजपा क्या

कहेगी, जनता पार्टी क्या कहेगी। इस अवसर का आप उपयोग कीजिए। मैं पिछले दो सालों से कह रहा हूं कि इस बारे में सभी पार्टियों को इन्वाल्व किया जाए और हकीकत देश के सामने रखकर जो स्थिति है उसके बारे में सोचा जाए कि हमें क्या करना चाहिए। अगर आप ऐसा करेंगे तो सारा देश आपके साथ रहेगा। अगर आप यह अच्छा काम करेंगे तो आपके 12 खून भी माफ हो जायेंगे और इस देश में आपकी छवि मजबूत बनेगी। आज देश का किसान चाहता है कि उसको मायूस मत कीजिए। मैं खुद किसान हूं। मैं पिछले दो सालों में फायदे में इसलिए हूं क्योंकि मैंने अपने खेतों में हल ही नहीं जोता है। आज हल चलाना नुकसान का कारण है। दो साल से हमारी जमीन बंजर पड़ी हुई है। हम अगर पैडी उगाना चाहते हैं तो उस पर 450 रुपया खर्च आता है जब कि थाईलैंड का चावल 5.50 रुपए में हिन्दुस्तान में बिक रहा है। इसलिए मैं आपसे विनती करता हूं कि इसको प्रेस्टिज इश्यु मत बनाइये। क्लिंटन को देख कर, बुश को देख कर हमें पालिसी नहीं बनानी चाहिये बल्कि अपने देश के गरीब को देख कर पालिसी बनाने की कोशिश करें। मैं समझता हूं यही महात्मा गांधी जी ने कहा था कि हमने देश की आजादी इसलिए ली थी कि देश पूर्ण तरह से स्वतंत्र हो, आर्थिक गुलामी किसी भी तरह की न हो। उनको अपने लिए सूट करता है। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं जिस वक्त एयरलाइंस का मसला आया सिंगापुर एयरलाइंस को डोमेस्टिक में हमने घुसने नहीं दिया। अखबार वाले लिखते रहे। हमने उनसे सवाल किया अमरीका में आज कोई नान अमरीकन एयरलाइंस चला नहीं सकता, अमरीका में कोई नान अमरीकन ब्राडकास्टिंग कंपनी नहीं खोल सकता। लेकिन हमारे यहां हम रिफार्म्स के नाम पर सब को इजाजत दें, क्या जरूरत है? हमने सिंगापुर एयरलाइंस को यहां आने नहीं दिया तो इससे क्या हुआ जेट एयरलाइंस और सहारा की वजह से देश का पैसा देश में रहा। जेट एयरलाइंस दो जहाज से शुरु हुआ, आज उनके पास तीस जहाज हैं। देश का पैसा देश में रहा। अगर हमारी पालिसी उस वक्त सिंगापुर एयरलाइंस को अलाऊ करने की होती तो आज सारा देश का पैसा सिंगापुर को जाता। यदि आप इस नीति को ला सकते हैं, यदि स्वदेशी की भावना आप लाना चाहते हैं तो इस भावना को आपको जगाना चाहिये। चाहे आप हजार यहां डिसकस कर लो जब तक सहमति नहीं बनाएंगे, वार फुटिंग लाइन पर, अगर इकोनोमिक इमरजेंसी डिक्लेयर नहीं करोगे तो मैं समझता हूं कि कोई देश को कंट्रोल नहीं कर सकता। आप भी नहीं कर सकते हैं। आपके जाने के बाद कोई दूसरा भी आए तो उनको भी यही करना चाहिये कि देश के अन्दर बिगड़ी हुई आर्थिक परिस्थिति को हम किस तरह से सुधारें, किस तरह से विदेशियों के पंजों से हम छूट सकते हैं। आज सारा मिडल ईस्ट बरबाद हो गया, रशिया बरबाद हो गया, चीन क्यों बरबाद नहीं हुआ? वहां पर रिफार्म हुए हैं लेकिन चीन के टर्म्स पर हुए हैं। यह किसी अमरीकन टर्म्स पर रिफार्म नहीं हुए बल्कि उन्होंने अपने टर्म्स पर रिफार्म किये हैं। आज सारी दुनियां पर चीन हावी हो रहा है। अगर भारत भी अपने टर्म बनाए और एक सहमति बनाए तो मैं समझता हूं कि भारत की आर्थिक आजादी बची रहेगी। कलंक ले कर मत जाइयेगा। सत्ता पांच साल रहेगी, दस साल रहेगी लेकिन इतिहास में नाम रहेगा, आगे आने वाली पीढ़ी जब पढ़ेगी कि इनके काल में यह नहीं होने दिया गया तो इतिहास में आप अमर रहोगे। पाँच साल, दस साल कुर्सी पर बैठना कोई बड़ी बात नहीं है, किसी भी तरह से बैठ सकते हैं लेकिन उतरने के बाद आगे आने वाला नौजवान इतिहास के पन्ने पढ़ेगा, उसको आप स्वर्ण अक्षरों में लिखने का मौका देंगे, इस विश्वास के साथ मैं आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूं। धन्यवाद।

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Goa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I will

intervene very briefly in this debate to seek some clarifications. ...(*Interruptions*)... Yes; please.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DISINVESTMENT, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS AND PUBLIC GRIEVANCES OF THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS (SHRI ARUN SHOURIE) : I will take a few minutes. For five years, I have been trying to find out something, as we have ... If you just permit me.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Goa) : You can. I have absolutely no problem.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: There is just one question. I will be greatly educated to seek clarification on this question since Shri Ibrahim is here. He has raised this question. Sir, I came here almost three years ago, and since then I have been trying to find out one thing. I am in Government, accidentally, as you have rightly said. I am still trying to find out the same. Nobody is able to tell me. आपने जेट एयरवेज़ का जिक्र किया और करेक्टली कंट्रास्ट किया फॉरेन एयरलाइंस का Who owns Jet Airways? Is it an Indian airline or a foreign airline? Because, thus far, what I have been able to discover through all agencies of Government is that Jet Airways is owned by a company called Tailwinds. That Tailwinds is registered in the Isle of Man, and nobody knows who owns Tailwinds in the Isle of Man, a tax haven. Shri Ibrahim was quite right that we should encourage domestic airlines. I just want to know whether Jet is a domestic airline or not.

SHRI C.M. IBRAHIM: Sir, as far as the question of airlines is concerned, I would say that when we announced this policy, the Emirates Airlines and the Gulf Airlines were also participating in it. We told them in clear terms that no foreign airlines can participate in domestic airlines. So, they were disinvested. उनको पैसा दिया गया गल्फ एयर और इमीरेट्स को निकाला गया। And as far as my knowledge is concerned, the Jet Airways is run by an Indian, and the money is in India.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I am on the issue of ownership, not whether the money is kept in India or not.

SHRI C.M. IBRAHIM: As far as ownership is concerned, according to our information नाम तो मैं भूल नहीं सकता क्योंकि भूलने की कोई जरूरत भी नहीं है, It is an Indian company, as far as my knowledge is concerned.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI) : Anyway, Shri Faleiro.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Goa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would just intervene very briefly in this debate, basically, to seek some clarifications from the Government. I must say that we must admit that the state of the economy has never been so bad for decades, as it is now. Now, the Standard and Poor's rate has gone from stable to negative when we have huge reserves of foreign exchange. The rating is worse than it was in 1990-91, when we had to pawn our gold to foreign banks. The situation is very bad. It is not a question of Standard and Poor's rating, but it is a question of knowing ourselves on the ground what the situation is. I myself know about agriculture and I can say how the price of agriculture has collapsed to a point that farmers are committing suicides because they have no other source of living. I know that personally. I have the figures, how much it costs me to produce our main crops, in my area, like coconut, arecanut and cashew; and how much we get out of it. It is negative. That is about agriculture.

My friends told me that it is the same situation with regard to industry. Many from the industry who were supporting your party are having second thoughts after seeing how badly the economy is being managed. We know about the man who is neither in industry nor in agriculture, but just a pensioner, who has deposited his little savings in a bank. See the tragedy of the UTI. They have reduced the dividend to less than a half. You see some of the average units, half-yearly dividend was 4 per cent, last half-yearly dividend was less than the rate of interest given by the banks. The public sector financial institutions are inter-linked, one advances money to the other. As far as the financial institutions are concerned, the fear is that the worst days are ahead. It is a terrible situation. Therefore, I appeal to all the Members to rise above party lines and work for the welfare of the people. The times are too bad. The people are suffering. Perhaps, they never suffered before like that. Therefore, let us all get together and work together for a national consensus on these matters which concern the survival of the people, who are not in this House. We are not so badly

placed. The people who are really bad and people who have no voice are outside. I think they are one billion people. Therefore, we cannot any more let them down. We must get together, rise above party lines -- we may keep our differences for some other occasion and on some other issues -- to save the economy. This is the time which really can be a great time for India. We have tremendous manpower. This is the time of globalisation which can be a great time for India. Let us take advantage of our manpower. Let us flower and flourish. We, as Members, who have been elected by the people, who really run the Government and the economy, should get together and find a solution to this problem.

Now, let me seek some clarifications. One of the problems we are facing in agriculture is because of the WTO. You see the developed countries, beginning with the United States, going along, even higher, to Japan, Australasia and Europe, they are heavily subsidising their farmers up to 50 to 60 per cent of the actual market costs which go into the production. We are subsidising our farmers a little bit in irrigation, electricity which hardly comes to 3 to 4 per cent. There is a big disparity which we cannot allow to continue. We must do something for our farmers and for the poor people, the normal people who have no voice who are in large numbers. We have to work for them. We must do something for them.

That takes me to the WTO and the WTO negotiations. Sir, we have had all the top brass of the United States here, from Richard Armitage to Robert Zoelich, shall we say A to Z, everybody had been here from Armitage to Zoelich. What have we got out of it? The point, I really want to make by contribution here is this. We have to work upon the WTO with a sense of professionalism which is so crucial. In the United States, you have the Commerce Secretary. Why I am participating in this debate is, I want to make this main point. In the United States, you have the Commerce Secretary, you have the Trade Representative, Mr. Zoelich. The Commerce Secretary is the Commerce Minister. The Trade Representative is the man who actually runs the negotiations of the WTO. He has access to everybody else in the Cabinet and to the President also. He is a professional. He is a trade lawyer. He has a staff with him something like 1,600 people, who are lawyers, who know about the trade. They are economists. What do we have here? We have Secretaries. We have Additional Secretaries and a couple of Deputy Secretaries and a couple of other people. It is too little in terms of quantity and even less in terms of quality. I have high regard for

our Secretaries, they are the cream of the IAS officers. But, then, you can never know everything. They keep shifting. They keep changing. Therefore, the important point that must be kept in mind is, please ensure that the WTO negotiations are conducted with professionalism. Just see the United States, which is an example, and other countries which are worth emulating. Therefore, you must see that professionals come into this, professionals work on this, so that we can go prepared for the WTO negotiations. We should not go with a prepared speech and read it out. We should have people with an in-depth knowledge who can really challenge them and advance our cause with professionalism. That is the main point that I want to make here.

The second point that I want to make is, where are we on the American's invitation to have a fresh round of negotiations without really implementing the previous commitments? As far as I understand, there are about 40 to 45 countries from the South, that is, developing countries and, maybe, many others, who are opposed to this. They want implementation first. Zimbabwe represents Africa. Pakistan and Malaysia are representing this area. What is our view on this? Do we support the American position that we must have a fresh round of negotiations and then keep the schedule of implementation to some other day? I feel, before we proceed further, we should first insist upon the implementation of the previous commitments.

Then, I would like to know, what is our position on the American invitation to have an informal meeting next month, in Mexico -- wherein about 25 or so, countries representing both the developed world and the developing countries participate -- to prepare for the Ministerial meeting in Doha? What is the agenda? What is the approach to the meeting of the WTO Ministerial meeting?

Sir, the point that I am making -- before I conclude -- is this : Take the Opposition into confidence. This is definitely a national economic emergency situation. Therefore, all of us must work together, not in the party's interest, or, our class interest, but in the interest of the billions of our people, who, if given a chance can prove to be the best in the world, as good as anybody else. Thank you.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : इस अल्पकालिक चर्चा पर आगे चर्चा, सोमवार,

दिनांक 20 अगस्त, 2001 को जारी रहेगी। अब सदन की कार्यवाही भोजनावकाश के लिए अपराह्न 2.30 बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned for lunch at twenty-nine minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-four minutes past two of the clock,

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAMA SHANKER KAUSHIK) in the Chair]

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

Increasing Erosion of the Federal Principles in Centre-State relations due to the Union Government usurpring the powers of the State Governments - *Contd.*

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : अब हम माननीय श्री एस. रामचन्द्रन पिल्लै द्वारा उपस्थित संकल्प 'यह सभा संघ सरकार द्वारा राज्य सरकारों की शक्तियों को हड़पने के कारण केन्द्र-राज्य संबंधों में संघीय सिद्धान्तों के बढ़ते हुए अपक्षय पर अपनी गहरी चिन्ता व्यक्त करती है' पर आगे चर्चा करेंगे। माननीय श्री मीणा जी, आप बोलिए।

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा (राजस्थान) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, श्री एस. रामचन्द्रन पिल्लै जी ने जो संकल्प प्रस्तुत किया है, वह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण है। आज केन्द्र और राज्य के संबंधों में कई तरह के विवाद सामने आ रहे हैं। भारतीय संविधान की एक विशेषता रही है कि इसके अनुसार शासन व्यवस्था दो तरह की होती है - एकात्मक, संघात्मक। भारतीय संविधान के रचयिताओं ने भारतीय संविधान में इन दोनों पहलुओं को ही रखा है - एकात्मक स्वरूप भी इसका हमको दिखाई देता है और समय-समय पर संघात्मक स्वरूप भी इसका हमें दिखाई देता है। डा. अम्बेडकर ने भारतीय संविधान के स्वरूप के विषय में कहा है कि भारतीय संविधान समय के अनुसार एकात्मक और संघात्मक स्वरूप ले सकता है। चाहे संविधान के निर्माताओं ने संविधान में कहीं भी संघीय शब्द का प्रयोग न किया हो तो भी इस संविधान में संघीय लक्षण विद्यमान हैं। आजादी के 50 साल के बाद यदि हम देखते हैं तो हमें भारतीय संविधान के दोनों लक्षण दिखाई देते हैं - जब कभी भी देश के अंदर आपातकालीन स्थिति पैदा हुई तो देश का और संविधान का एकात्मक स्वरूप दिखाई दिया और साधारण परिस्थितियों में तो संघात्मक स्वरूप कार्य कर ही रहा है। इसलिए संविधान निर्माताओं ने जो अपेक्षाएं इस संविधान से की थीं, वे अपेक्षाएं इस संविधान ने पूरी की हैं।

संविधान के अंदर राज्य और केन्द्र के संबंध में संविधान निर्माताओं ने एक ऐसी